UNITED NATIONS

A

General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/46/PV.62
17 December 1991

ENGLISH

Forty-sixth session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 41st MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 4 December 1991, at 3 p.m.

President:	Mr. SHIHABI	(Saudi Arabia)
later:	Mr. MIN (Vice-President)	(Myanmar)

- Current financial crisis of the United Nations; financial emergency of the United Nations: report of the Secretary-General [109 and 110]

- Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa [37] (continued)

  (a) Report of the Special Committee against Apartheid

  (b) Report of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa

/...

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the General Assembly.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

91-61947 7795V (E)

(c) Reports of the Secretary-General

(d) Report of the Special Political Committee

- United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa [102] (continued)

(a) Report of the Secretary-General

(b) Draft resolution

- Programme of work

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 109 AND 110

CURRENT FINANCIAL CRISIS OF THE UNITED NATIONS; FINANCIAL EMERGENCY OF THE UNITED NATIONS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/46/600 and Add. 1)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): Members will recall that, at its 54th plenary meeting, the General Assembly decided that the report of the Secretary-General on the financial situation of the United Nations (A/46/600 and Add.1) would be introduced in the plenary Assembly under agenda item 109, Current financial crisis of the United Nations, and agenda item 110, Financial emergency of the United Nations, on the understanding that the substantive consideration of those items would remain in the Fifth Committee.

Members were also informed that, in the light of that decision, the Secretary-General would address the General Assembly on the subject of the financial situation of the United Nations.

Representatives wishing to make statements under agenda items 109 and 110 may do so during the consideration of those items by the Fifth Committee, scheduled to begin on Tuesday, 10 December 1991.

Accordingly, I now call on the Secretary-General of the United Nations, His Excellency Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar.

The SECRETARY-GENERAL: Yesterday when welcoming the new Secretary-General, I said that the renaissance of the Organization has not yet been reflected in its financial situation. The irony of the contrast between the high expectations rightly placed in the United Nations and the financial indigence to which it has been reduced carries a note of deep regret and perplexity.

It saddens me that I should have to convey this sombre note to the Assembly in one of my last statements. The financial insolvency of the United Nations has confronted it with a crisis which, I must stress, is at once political and budgetary.

The comprehensive account of the financial situation of the United Nations which I gave in the report before you presents a grim picture. As of 31 October 1991, Member States owed the Organization nearly $1 billion in unpaid assessments for both the regular budget and peace-keeping activities.

The momentous events which have recently transformed the world scene have served to highlight the role of the United Nations as an effective instrument for realizing the collective will of the international community in keeping the peace, suppressing aggression and strengthening the basis of stability in international relations. But the Organization's ability to follow up on the demonstration of its capabilities has been severely hampered by want of the minimal financial resources needed to discharge its responsibilities.

In the last year or so, the United Nations has been entrusted with a multitude of tasks. It has launched no less than seven new operations: along the Iraq-Kuwait border, the United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observer Mission (UNIKOM), in El Salvador, the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador (ONUSAL), in Angola, the Second United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM II), in Central America, the United Nations Observer Group in Central

(The Secretary-General)

America (ONUCA), in Western Sahara, the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO) and in Cambodia, the United Nations Advance Mission in Cambodia (UNAMIC). Additionally, an election observation operation was carried out in Haiti, the United Nations Observer Group for the Verification of the Election in Hait (ONUVEH). Incidentally, the political developments following that operation by no means detract from its success.

To add to these, there are currently in place the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF), the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO), the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP) and the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP). With the exception of UNDOF, all are inadequately funded. I have had, in the course of the year, to borrow from other accounts to cover the obligations of UNIKOM, MINURSO and ONUCA. Such measures could lead to a real financial disaster for several operations, should the domino effect be triggered.

In addition, a highly complex set of tasks is being undertaken by the United Nations in Iraq pursuant to resolutions of the Security Council adopted under Chapter VII of the Charter. Furthermore, the United Nations has been called upon to give top priority to preventive diplomacy to help avert future conflicts and further to reinforce its role in peace-keeping.

Finally, to complete the picture, a vast array of new activities are also being undertaken in areas such as the environment, drug control, human rights and humanitarian relief. And, of course, there is a continuing preoccupation with the traditional economic and social development issues. The Organization is also being advised to strengthen its machinery for large-scale humanitarian assistance.

(The Secretary-General)

This unprecedented expansion of the Organization's activities demonstrates the confidence of the international community in the capacity of the United Nations to respond to complex and changing global needs. For its part, the Organization is scrupulously observing the principle of economy. This is proved by the fact that the increased rate for the proposed programme budget for 1992-1993 is no more than 0.9 per cent.

Yet, even as these new responsibilities are being piled on the Organization, no serious consideration appears to be given to how these operations are to be financed. Reliance is being placed on the existing, conventional financing arrangements of the United Nations which have proved, as they are bound to prove, woefully deficient. The combination of escalating responsibilities and the failure to provide the resources to meet them has landed the United Nations in a dangerously precarious financial condition.

Given this situation and considering the difficulties pleaded by many countries in meeting their obligations to the Organization, the United Nations can only lurch from one state of financial desperation to another, unable, for all practical purposes, to meet its current cash commitments, let alone to plan ahead.

Should this threatening financial crisis continue, the Organization may well fail to carry out urgent and important activities, particularly in the areas of peace-keeping and peace-making. Such a failure, for lack not of will or capability but of means, could severely erode the regained confidence which has propelled Governments and the public to turn to the United Nations for the solution to problems that endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, the principal purpose of this Organization. If this were to happen, the losers would include: the peoples of the world who have the right to expect and demand an effective, dynamic and responsive United Nations in these

(The Secretary-General)

troubled times; those Member States which have regularly met their legal obligations and paid their contributions on time and in full and have basically served as the financial backbone of this Organization; and the staff who have devoted their lives and careers to this Organization.

I urge the 102 Member States which had failed, as of 31 October 1991, to meet in full their statutory financial obligations to the Organization to ponder these issues with all their implications in mind.

(The Secretary-General)

I appeal to them, and especially to those Member States with relatively prosperous economies, to pay now. It is regrettable that the group of countries in arrears include some which should be able to pay and which, for historical, political and constitutional reasons, bear a particular responsibility. It is paradoxical that Member States should fail to fund adequately and on a timely basis the programmes they elaborate, approve, and set deadlines for.

Even though this situation is well known, Member States have no hesitation in asking the Secretariat to undertake new, complex and challenging activities. Yesterday it was Cambodia. Tomorrow it could possibly be Yugoslavia. Can we predict that other situations will not arise? Will these activities be properly funded?

The time has clearly arrived for a fundamental re-examination of the situation and a fresh approach to the problem. It is necessary to consider new and creative ways of, on the one hand, ensuring full and prompt payment by Member States of assessed contributions and, on the other, broadening the resource base of the Organization beyond its traditional narrow confines.

I am convinced that the elements of a viable, durable solution can be found for both the short-term and the long-term. Let me reiterate some suggestions designed for this purpose which I have outlined in my report:

Proposal No. 1: Adopt a set of measures to deal with the cash flow problems caused by the exceptionally high levels of unpaid contributions and inadequate working capital reserves. First, charge interest on the amounts of assessed contributions that are not paid on time; secondly, suspend the financial regulations of the United Nations to permit the retention of

(The Secretary-General)

budgetary surpluses; thirdly, increase the Working Capital Fund to a level of $250 million from 1 January 1992 and endorse the principle that the level of the Fund should be approximately 25 per cent of the annual assessment under the regular budget; fourthly, establish a temporary peace-keeping reserve fund, at a level of $50 million, as from 1 January 1992, to meet the initial expenses of peace-keeping operations pending receipt of assessed contributions; fifthly, authorize the Secretary-General to borrow commercially, should the other sources of cash be inadequate.

Proposal No. 2: Establish a humanitarian revolving fund, to be used in emergency humanitarian situations, pending receipt of pledged contributions from donor Governments and others; the fund should be established at a level of $50 million by a one-time assessment of Member States.

Proposal No. 3: Establish a United Nations peace endowment fund, with an initial target level of $1 billion. The fund would be created by a combination of assessed and voluntary contributions, with the latter to be sought from Governments, the private sector and individuals. Once the fund reaches its target level, the proceeds from the investment of its principal would be used to finance the initial costs of authorized peace-keeping operations, other conflict resolution measures and related activities.

As we search for solutions to the financial problems of the Organization, we must recognize that many developing countries are going through painful structural adjustments in their economies. Formidable problems confront another important region of the world going through fundamental change in its economic system. This state of affairs may hamper the ability of these countries to make the contributions they should make and would want to make.

(The Secretary-General)

An essential element of any solution, therefore, must be to seek additional sources of funding, particularly by reaching beyond the traditional assessed contributions. I have outlined some of these approaches. Let me revert, however, to my third proposal which is particularly relevant to the financing of peace-keeping and related operations, namely, the peace endowment fund, initially targeted at $1 billion which could become an important framework in the search for a long-term solution.

I should hope that the economically advanced Member States, especially those that bear a particular responsibility because of historical and political reasons for the success of the Organization, would not only pay their assessed contributions but also make generous voluntary contributions to the endowment fund, thus making it possible to reach the initial target of $1 billion within the next 12 months.

The set of measures I have outlined should serve as a good starting-point for an exercise which is both necessary and long overdue: namely, addressing the perennial problem of imbalance between mandated tasks and allocated resources. This problem has plagued the United Nations for all too long, and only threatens to get worse.

Now that the confidence factor - previously invoked for withholding financial support from the United Nations - has been turned around, is it not time also to turn around the financial prospects of the Organization? If a new world order is emerging with the United Nations playing a central part, should we not strive now to equip it for its most necessary and historic role?

I urge the Assembly to work energetically with my successor, Mr. Boutros Ghali, to solve a problem which has vexed and harassed my

(The Secretary-General)

predecessors and myself. This would be a most credible way of helping the Organization to fulfil the promise and the vision of the Charter.

The PRESIDENT: I join the Secretary-General in his appeal to Member States to live up to their moral, financial and statutory responsibilities in fulfilling the needs of the United Nations of which they are Members. I think it is one aspect of a failure that should not continue in the coming days, which, it is to be hoped, we shall consider days of success for the United Nations, and I thank the Secretary-General for his eloquent, sincere, honest and meaningful statement.

I call on the representative of Canada on a point of order.

Mr. FORTIER (Canada): I should like indeed to raise a point of order. My delegation agrees that the debate on the specific substantive proposals which the Secretary-General has just made should take place in the Fifth Committee, as you yourself, Sir, have pointed out. However, the financial crisis of the Organization cannot only be treated as another item on our agenda. We cannot pass resolutions and expect the Organization to meet the demands Members are putting on it without paying their bills, and as the Secretary-General said in his landmark statement, this crisis is political, not just budgetary.

On behalf of the delegations of Canada, Australia and New Zealand, I should like to address the issues raised by the Secretary-General in this very broad context here in the plenary session of the General Assembly, and I understand that there are other delegations which would like to follow me to the rostrum, if that should be the wish of the Assembly.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The representative of Canada has requested to be allowed to make a statement in the plenary Assembly under agenda items 109 and 110.

Members will recall that the General Assembly, at its third plenary meeting, decided to allocate agenda items 109 and 110 to the Fifth Committee.

Furthermore, as I stated at the beginning of this meeting, the Assembly, at its 54th plenary meeting, on 25 November, decided that the report of the Secretary-General on the financial situation of the United Nations would be introduced in the plenary Assembly under agenda items 109 and 110, on the understanding that the substantive consideration of those items would remain in the Fifth Committee.

The intention was to afford the Secretary-General an opportunity to address the General Assembly on the subject of the financial situation of the United Nations in a plenary meeting. Representatives wishing to make statements on this matter can do so in the Fifth Committee, where these two agenda items will be considered starting on Tuesday, 10 December.

The report of the Fifth Committee on these items will eventually be considered in the plenary Assembly.

In the light of the request by the Permanent Representative of Canada, and taking into account the importance of the issues being discussed, I should like to consult the Assembly on whether the membership wishes to hear statements at this plenary meeting on these two items.

Is there any objection to hearing statements under items 109 and 110 at this meeting?

(The President)

If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly agrees to hear statements on these items at this meeting, without prejudice to their consideration by the Fifth Committee next week.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): This decision having been taken, and out of courtesy to the representatives who have already inscribed their names on the list of speakers for the next item on our agenda for this afternoon, I should like to appeal to the speakers on agenda items 109 and 110 to be brief.

Mr. FORTIER (Canada): Mr. President, thank you very much for your decision - and I assure you that I shall be brief.

I have the honour to address the Assembly today on behalf of my own Government and the Governments of Australia and New Zealand.

The subject we address today, the financial viability of the United Nations - a very sombre subject indeed - constitutes perhaps the most significant challenge to the effectiveness of our institution in years ahead. While Member States are constantly urging new activities on the Organization, many of them have proved unwilling to meet even their existing financial commitments to the United Nations. To use a well-known colloquialism, let us put our money where our mouth is.

At the outset, we strongly urge all delegations which have not yet met their obligations for 1991 or previous years to do so before the end of the year. Allow me to assure the Assembly that all three of our countries intend again this year to pay our 1992 assessments to the regular budget of the Organization on time.

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

From our perspective, a strong temptation might exist to lapse into self-righteousness on this topic. Our three countries can claim that we bear no responsibility for the financial crisis. Australia, New Zealand and Canada have always paid their contributions in full, on time, and on request in advance. We have supported multilateral action through some very depressing times. We do not intend to abandon or qualify our commitment to the United Nations now when it is showing signs of vitality. And we do not intend to engage in posturing on the critical financial issues before us today.

During the Secretary-General's most recent term of office, the United Nations Secretariat has carried out some of the most challenging mandates it has ever been asked to manage. It is a tribute to him and to his colleagues in the Secretariat that they have succeeded in spite of a constant cash-flow crisis. Under his leadership, Member States have come to rely on the Security Council to find solutions to longstanding conflicts. The General Assembly and its subsidiary organs, including those of the Economic and Social Council, are now internationally accepted forums where meaningful discussion of the challenges facing the world community can take place. One would presume that the future for the Organization could not be brighter.

Yet many of those Member States that use the United Nations political arena so effectively and are the most demanding of new services do not seem to be prepared to pay for the Organization.

Most Governments find it difficult to reconcile revenues with financial outlays. When one looks at spending priorities, it is easier to postpone paying the bill for a far-away institution pressing its financial requirements politely than to disappoint frequently shrill domestic constituencies. However, this approach by Member States is proving increasingly unsustainable

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

for the United Nations. So far the Secretariat has managed to serve the basic needs of the Security Council, the General Assembly and the other organs of the United Nations, even though it has been forced to live on a hand-to-mouth basis. This process of improvisation through management by financial crisis is no longer either feasible or sensible, as the Secretary-General has so rightly pointed out.

At the same time, while it is true that the Organization indeed has much to be proud of, Member States, including Australia, Canada and New Zealand, which have supported the United Nations through thick and thin, ask themselves whether their contributions are used as effectively as they should be. Issues of Secretariat reform have been discussed informally amongst a number of delegations. We share a wish to see an end to duplication, lack of coordination among different divisions of the Secretariat, and jealousies amongst the numerous United Nations agencies. Institutions meant to serve Member States are often remote and unresponsive. We remain hopeful that genuine reforms of both the structures and the operational approaches of the United Nations can be fostered. But we recognize that the encouragement of a culture of economy and efficiency in the Secretariat will be a futile endeavour if prompt payment of dues is simply to go on being avoided by many Members.

The United Nations now benefits from unequalled goodwill throughout the world community. We urge all Members to honour this goodwill by supporting the Secretary-General's call to take measures to provide the Organization with the resources it requires to allow it to respond rapidly to all Members' demands.

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

The proposals placed before the General Assembly by the Secretary-General warrant our fullest consideration. While they need discussion in detail - and some might need further elaboration - this should not be a cause to delay or defer decisions, at least on the more straightforward and longstanding proposals. Let us aim for a resolution that will be both a tribute to the outgoing Secretary-General and a welcome to his successor.

Without looking at the details of how the various proposals would be put into effect, we are in favour, in principle, of the need to establish a designated start-up fund for peace-keeping and of looking at ways to increase the Working Capital Fund. Our delegations have advocated greater financial flexibility for several years now, particularly because of the greatly expanded demands of peace-keeping missions.

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

We also think there is merit in the proposal to begin to charge interest on assessments 30 days after payment is due. However, unfortunate recent experience in other organizations leads us to be sceptical about the wisdom of the United Nations borrowing money on the open market. Finally, the proposal concerning a peace endowment fund is innovative. We would need to discuss the concept with members of the Secretariat and other delegations.

How to improve the capacity of the United Nations to respond to humanitarian emergencies and how to provide funds for relief is one of the major issues being discussed at this session of the Assembly and is of keen interest to all three of our delegations. We will continue our active participation in relief operations around the globe, in large part, we hope, through better-coordinated United Nations activities.

In conclusion, we are in complete agreement with the Secretary-General that the United Nations needs secure funding to be more effective. The situation we are now facing is both intolerable and untenable. However, the burden of supplying the necessary funds needs to be shared fairly. All Member States must meet their obligations when they come due. If not, those Member States with the best record of support for the United Nations may come under domestic pressure to delay payment in future so as not to subsidize those Members with a poor record.

Mr. BREITENSTEIN (Finland): I am grateful for the opportunity to make this statement on behalf of the five Nordic countries.

During the general debate at this forty-sixth session of the General Assembly, many speakers welcomed the emerging favourable climate for international cooperation. In your summary, Mr. President, you yourself underlined the importance of the general support that had been expressed by Member States for a strengthened role for the United Nations as a result of

(Mr. Breitenstein, Finland)

the positive new developments in the world. Yet at the same time, we now face a serious financial crisis in the Organization. The paradox is that we have an organization on which we place increasing demands, particularly in the area of peace-keeping and conflict resolution, but also an organization that lacks the resources to fulfil the role we want it to play. If Member States have the political will to launch new activities and operations, they ought also to have the political will to finance their implementation.

It is obvious that there would be no financial crisis if all Member States paid their assessed contributions on time and in full and if, in addition, the Secretary-General had sufficient reserves at his disposal. Clearly, the United Nations is highly respected and valued by all its Member States. Why, then, do so many of them ignore their statutory obligations? The assessed contributions cannot possibly constitute an unreasonable burden on any Member State. The benefits of membership far outweigh the expense involved.

During this session of the General Assembly the Secretary-General has repeatedly drawn the attention of Member States to the critical financial situation of the Organization. The Nordic delegations would like to express their appreciation to him for his efforts to make Member States pay their assessed contributions and arrears, pertaining both to the regular budget and to peace-keeping operations.

Let me also add that the Nordic countries fully agree with the Secretary-General's statement yesterday when he extended his congratulations to his successor, Mr. Boutros Boutros Ghali, and said something to this effect: that he was happy to hand over to his successor a stronger and

(Mr. Breitenstein, Finland)

healthier United Nations, the only negative aspect being its financial insolvency, a situation which most assuredly was not due to bad management.

The report of the Secretary-General now before us (A/46/600 and Add.1) presents an alarming picture of the financial situation of the Organization. We appreciate the detailed information that has been made available to us on the pattern of payments of each Member State. That information clearly demonstrates the seriousness of the situation, as did the statement that the Secretary-General made just a few minutes ago.

I can say that the Nordic countries welcome the Secretary-General's view on how to address the situation and that we support the main thrust of his proposals. We hope that the urgency of the situation, along with a greater crisis awareness, will be conducive to speedy action. What we need more than anything else is a new spirit of involvement with, participation in, and shared responsibility for the United Nations.

The Nordic countries attach particular importance to the establishment of a peace-keeping reserve fund. The Secretary-General should be provided with the necessary resources to permit him to take immediate action when the need arises. We have long been of the opinion that arrangements should be made to facilitate the start-up of new operations. We therefore support the establishment of a peace-keeping fund at this session of the General Assembly.

We also believe that the Working Capital Fund should be increased to a level of approximately 25 per cent of the annual assessment under the regular budget. We consider this percentage reasonable to ensure sufficient liquidity, especially since the Fund is also used to accommodate unforeseen and extraordinary expenses.

(Mr. Breitenstein, Finland)

Furthermore, we believe that the three funds, the Working Capital Fund, a peace-keeping reserve fund and a humanitarian revolving fund, would go a long way towards meeting the Secretary-General's well-founded demands for budget reserves. Reserves are a prerequisite of smooth and rational operations and are in line with sound budgetary practices.

The financial problems of the United Nations must, naturally, also be dealt with on a broader scale and in a longer time frame. We believe that the setting of priorities for programmes should be taken into account in this discussion. This is of course a matter primarily to be dealt with in the context of the programme-planning and budget process. There is, however, a link between this process and the financial crisis. The pattern of payments by Member States can be seen as a measure or a reflection of the degree of confidence that individual Member States have in the Organization.

I have presented these views on behalf of the Nordic countries in the hope that a comprehensive solution can be found at this session of the General Assembly to avoid the financial insolvency of the Organization. As Members, we all have a responsibility to ensure that the Organization has the resources required to carry out the tasks that we, collectively, have entrusted to it. The United Nations can operate on a sound financial basis only if the method of financing is strictly adhered to and respected by all Member States. The only real and lasting solution to the financial crisis is payment by all Member States of their assessed contributions in full and on time and without conditions. The principle of collective responsibility for the expenses of the Organization embodied in Article 17 of the Charter must be upheld. To pay one's assessed contribution is a treaty obligation, not an option.

Mr. VAN SCHAIK (Netherlands): I will speak on behalf of the twelve member States of the European Community.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to make a brief statement on this very important and urgent matter. We listened with great interest to the important statement made by the Secretary-General in which he underlined the very serious financial situation of the Organization. We appreciate the fact that the Secretary-General has addressed the issue at the plenary level of the Assembly.

(Mr. Van Schaik, Netherlands)

His statement, as well as his report, will be studied expeditiously, in a positive spirit, and we shall return to it in the Fifth Committee.

Global political developments have made clear to us all that the United Nations is at the dawn of a new era. The demands on the Organization are increasing and the Members' expectations are rising. Member States are exploring avenues to give the Organization renewed vitality and to establish an appropriate structure for the Secretariat.

The 12 member States of the European Community are deeply concerned about the grave financial crisis confronting the Organization. While that crisis has been developing over the years, it should be addressed with the greatest possible urgency.

Aware of these facts, the Twelve are preoccupied about the prevailing situation, as it demonstrates that the very Member States that time and again underline the Organization's importance and in fact do not hesitate to call upon its good offices are allowing its financial situation to deteriorate to the point where its effectiveness risks being called into question. It seems these Member States trust that the Organization, at the last minute, will always be bailed out by those Members, like the 12 member States of the European Community - together they contribute over 30 per cent of the assessed contributions - that honour their obligations to the United Nations and pay their contributions promptly, in full and without conditions.

In this context the Twelve wish to recall that they and other States Members of the Organization have stressed year after year that the difficult financial situation of the United Nations is intolerable and that there is only one solution to it, and let me repeat: that all Member States comply with the obligation to pay their share of the Organization's expenses as

(Mr. Van Schaik, Netherlands)

apportioned by the General Assembly. This is not a discretionary matter and is not subject to any conditionality; rather, it is a solemn obligation under Article 17 of the Charter.

Non-compliance with this obligation also calls into question the willingness of Member States to uphold the new budget process established under resolution 41/213. This landmark resolution emphasizes the desirability of efforts to achieve the broadest possible agreement on the financial appropriations. It should be borne in mind that both the current budget and the current scale of assessment based on capacity to pay were adopted by consensus. It would be ironic in such circumstances if Member States fail to honour what is a political commitment, as well as a binding legal obligation.

As to the Secretary-General's longer-term proposals, the Twelve would, first of all, agree to his statement (A/46/600) that non-payment by Member States has placed an unjust burden on those Member States that meet their financial obligations. The proposals before the General Assembly consist essentially of enlarging the reserves. While this might merit serious consideration in circumstances where all Member States meet their obligations, as things stand at present, there is a risk of further increasing the burden on those Member States that already pay promptly and in full. In our view the main problem is the financing of the reserves, rather than their size.

The solution to the immediate financial crisis is straightforward: all Member States must pay promptly and in full. At this time when the community of nations is looking to the United Nations to play a greatly enhanced role in world affairs, the question of improving its financial basis should be addressed. The Twelve are willing to work constructively with the

(Mr. Van Schaik, Netherlands)

Secretary-General and the Member States to consider appropriate measures in this regard on the understanding that all Member States fulfil their commitments and obligations to the Organization.

Mr. HOHENFELLNER (Austria): At the outset, allow me to express our deep appreciation to the Secretary-General for having personally introduced his report on the financial situation of the United Nations, and thus drawn our special attention to the Organization's severe financial crisis, which it is indeed facing. Austria shares the Secretary-General's profound concern that the United Nations is on the brink of insolvency and bankruptcy. As he eloquently and clearly points out in his report, the salaries for United Nations staff members may not be paid and the programmes approved and the mandates given by us Member States may not be carried out.

My delegation finds it intolerable that at a time when the Organization is entrusted with new tasks in virtually all areas - environment, development, international drug control, peace-keeping operations - it is not endowed with the necessary financial means effectively to implement these activities. This means not only pure lip-service of some Member States, but also missing what is probably a unique chance for the world community jointly to tackle global and regional problems after the end of the cold war. Moreover, it is not logical and not understandable that the Organization's existence be endangered at a time of enhanced reputation and increased confidence in international public opinion.

The constant burdening of the Organization with more activities to be carried out, while the budget is hardly growing and is even stagnating, places the United Nations in a difficult situation. In this light, it is

(Mr. Hohenfellner, Austria)

unacceptable that some Member States do not pay their assessed contributions at the Organization's expense. It is also unfair to those Members that do fulfil their financial obligations in accordance with Article 17 of the Charter of the United Nations and, with regard to the peace-keeping budget, places an additional burden on the troop-contributing countries.

My delegation therefore strongly appeals to all Member States in arrears with their financial obligations to fulfil their obligations under the Charter at the earliest possible date. Immediate compliance on the part of these Member States would solve the financial crisis. In this context we wish to reiterate Austria's strong support for the United Nations and its cause. For this reason, Austria is particularly proud to be one of the Organization's host countries. Over the years, Austria has proven its commitment by, inter alia, meeting its financial obligations. Allow me to assure the Secretary-General through you, Mr. President, that Austria will continue to pay its contributions to the regular as well as to the peace-keeping budgets in full and on time. Nevertheless, we agree with the Secretary-General that a viable, durable, long-term solution to the financial crisis, which is a perennial problem, has to be found. We have noted with regret that the new budgetary process established under resolution 41/213 has not borne the fruit expected.*

---

* Mr. Min (Myanmar), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Hohenfellner, Austria)

Unfortunately, therefore, the process of taking decisions by consensus on all budgetary matters has not produced the expected benefits, nor has it enhanced the political will of some Member States to pay their share of the expenses that they agreed to pay.

We believe that the proposals put forward by the Secretary-General deserve detailed discussion and thorough examination in the General Assembly. My delegation is willing to cooperate actively and constructively in the search for a durable solution to this crisis.

I should like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General for his sincere commitment to this Organization and its goals. Today - such a short time before the end of his term - he has once more proven his commitment by proposing measures to achieve a lasting solution of the severe financial crisis. He deserves our full respect, appreciation and support.

Mr. MONTAÑO (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I listened most attentively to the statement of the Secretary-General. I agree entirely with his view that this is a political problem, and one that obviously requires proper treatment and thorough consideration.

As Chairman of the Latin American and Caribbean Group for the month of December, I should like to convey to the Assembly that Group's particular concern about the financial situation of the Organization. However, I should like also to make a formal request that this debate be resumed in plenary meeting before the item is considered by the Fifth Committee. I am aware of the time restrictions, but, having heard very sound statements from various delegations this afternoon, we feel that it is necessary that other groups and other delegations that are not prepared to speak at this time be given an

(Mr. Montaño, Mexico)

opportunity to make proper, well-thought-out statements, as has been done by those representatives who have expressed the same degree of concern. It is a degree of concern that we all feel.

We would request you, Mr. President, to reply to our formal request that this debate not be concluded today, that it be continued in plenary meeting, with the Secretary-General present - his schedule being taken into account - so that other delegations may be able to express their views on an equal footing.

The PRESIDENT: Subject to the agreement of President Shihabi, the Secretariat will be instructed to arrange a schedule that will provide an opportunity for further statements at an appropriate time next week - perhaps on Tuesday.

AGENDA ITEMS 37 AND 102 (continued)

POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA

(a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID (A/46/22)

(b) REPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL GROUP TO MONITOR THE SUPPLY AND SHIPPING OF OIL AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS TO SOUTH AFRICA (A/46/44)

(c) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/46/499, A/46/507, A/46/648)

(d) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/46/643)

(e) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/46/L.31)

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA

(a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/46/561)

(b) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/46/L.31)

Mr. SHAHEED (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): Any assessment of the events in racist South Africa over the past four decades would bear witness to the grave injustice, racial discrimination, oppression

(Mr. Shaheed, Syrian Arab Republic)

and systematic violence to which the African majority has been subjected under the system of apartheid.

Statistics show that there have been more than 17 million arrests of people from the indigenous population found in areas reserved for the white minority; the dispossession of 3.5 million people of their homes; 80,000 detentions without trial; and up to 40,000 South Africans driven into foreign exile. It is more difficult to measure the destruction of families torn apart by racial reclassification, the ravages of inferior education, deprivation of job skills and the attendant suffocation of self-worth.

During the past few months, South Africa has witnessed several events. De Klerk has assumed a reformist posture by repealing the major laws that institutionalized apartheid. Nevertheless, it is difficult to believe that the odious system of apartheid is about to disappear. The repeal of the Population Registration Act, which stipulated the racial classification of newly born babies according to the colour of their skin, will have no retrospective effects. In other words, the provisions of the Population Registration Act will continue to be enforced on the African majority, who will not benefit from the repeal act until the country has been completely rid of apartheid. Moreover, the repeal of that act will continue to be meaningless so long as the apartheid tricameral Parliament continues to exist.

As for the Land Measures Act, which allowed the Whites, of whom there are about 5 million, to own 87 per cent of the land, through the dispossession of the indigenous population, the repeal act does not envisage the restitution of property to the original owners. On the other hand, the African majority, which has been impoverished by the racist regime, does not have the necessary

(Mr. Shaheed, Syrian Arab Republic)

funds to buy back the land it originally owned, and which should be restituted at no cost.

These aforementioned laws, like all the other laws that institutionalized apartheid, derive their validity from the main law that is the constitution of racist South Africa. That constitution is the basis of apartheid. It will undoubtedly take scores of years to wipe out the odious system of apartheid and racial segregation from legislation, procedures, minds and hearts. Clear evidence of that is to be found in other countries, where racial discrimination, although legally abrogated several decades ago, continues to affect large sections of the populations.

In his second interim report on the implementation of the Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa (A/45/1052), the Secretary-General states that the most basic laws of apartheid were removed by June 1991.

(Mr. Shaheed, Syrian Arab Republic)

He nevertheless points out that many of the concomitant attitudes and practices, and indeed the consequences of those laws, still persist. Therefore, it is no wonder that Christopher Warren, the correspondent of The New York Times in Johannesburg, should give us this picture of public life in Pretoria in his article of 10 November 1991:

(spoke in English)

"The basic laws mandating racial discrimination were repealed in June. But the structure of a white predominantly Afrikaner Civil Service who put apartheid policies into practice remains intact ... Indeed, a visitor to Pretoria, the administrative capital and a city with a high proportion of Afrikaners, finds whites occupying the offices and answering phones, while blacks mow the grass, fix the roads and make the tea."

(spoke in Arabic)

In the light of this, others are free to believe, if they wish, that the odious system of apartheid died on the 7th of June 1991, but the African majority believes that apartheid will not be buried until the day when that majority can enjoy and fully exercise the right to vote, until the day the country is free from the misery resulting from the policy of apartheid, some of the facets of which I mentioned at the beginning of my statement.

The African majority continues to live, since 1984, in the grip of a wave of violence which has resulted from the hateful policy, practices and structures of apartheid. That wave of violence has taken a toll of more than 11,000 lives according to the estimates of human rights organizations.

(Mr. Shaheed, Syrian Arab Republic)

There is no doubt that the Peace Accord signed on 14 September last is of course better than no agreement at all even if it was not fully implemented. It is also better than killing innocents because they wear the wrong headband. That Accord was a heavy blow dealt to the racist Government of Pretoria which continues to benefit from fanning the flames of violence. The Government of Pretoria is capable of putting an end to the acts of violence if it so wishes. Up to this minute, however, there is nothing to indicate that the Government has the intention of putting an end to the violence, which has brought untold suffering and misery on the African majority. In some instances, the violence stoked up by the racist Government of Pretoria has reached the level of real massacres which have earned the condemnation of the whole world.

A Sergeant in the South African Army by the name of Felix Andeni has made full confession to the British daily The Independent, on 19 July 1991 to the effect that most of those massacres are in actual fact the work of specialized units in the South African Army. Andeni gave clear details of the activities of the Fifth Intelligence Brigade, wherein he worked from 1989 to 1990. He has also unmasked the fact that the massacre of the train in the Soweto area of 13 September 1990, when 26 passengers were killed, was arranged by the First Unit of the Fifth Intelligence Brigade and, that he personally participated with others in the perpetrations of that awful massacre.

In an article by Mr. Warren in The New York Times of 12 June 1991, other facts were revealed by Mr. Nicho Bassoun, a retired Major of the Military Intelligence of the South African Army to the effect that he actively was

(Mr. Shaheed, Syrian Arab Republic)

involved in planning and carrying out attacks against the population in and around Johannesburg and the mobilization of the segments of the population who carried out those acts of violence.

This was not the end of it. The newspaper The Weekly Mail of Johannesburg has revealed the so-called Inkathagate scandal when it published copies of documents that proved that the Government of South Africa, with the seeming knowledge of de Klerk himself, finances the organizations which perpetrate acts of violence in the townships.

All these facts reaffirmed the arguments continually made by the African majority concerning the involvement of the Government security forces in the stoking of the acts of violence which are directly a result of the continued existence of the policy and practices and structures of apartheid. It is to be feared that if this wave of violence, which is being stoked up by the Government of Pretoria, were to continue, it would abort all the steps taken towards a settlement in southern Africa that would restore the legitimate usurped rights of the African majority.

We call upon the struggling African majority to close ranks, to join forces and to intensify its efforts to create a strong, unified front against the racist regime of South Africa, which wishes to weaken the negotiating position of the African majority by fanning of the flames of violence. We call upon the racist Government of South Africa to put an immediate end to this wave of violence through which it wants to impede the progress of the legitimate cause of the African majority.

(Mr. Shaheed, Syrian Arab Republic)

Since 1974, the General Assembly has consistently condemned the collaboration between Pretoria and Tel Aviv. The Special Committee against Apartheid in South Africa and its international consequences, upon the request of the General Assembly has continued to review the developments of this collaboration and to submit annual reports thereon since 1977. We view the problem of the collaboration between the regimes of Pretoria and Tel Aviv from the standpoint of its effect on the efforts aimed at the elimination of apartheid in South Africa and the threat that this collaboration poses to African and Arab States.

The causes and motives of this collaboration which has been branded by the General Assembly, in its resolution 3151 G (XXVIII) as a sinister alliance, are well known.

The British Independent published on 11 November 1991 an article by Mr. John Cortin entitled "A Sinister Trade Between Israel and Pretoria", in which the writer tried to explain the motives for this collaboration between Israel and racist South Africa since 1948:

(spoke in English)

"South Africa and Israel, united by the international hostility each has long provoked, have built up, over 25 years, a shadowy, sinister and mutually advantageous network of military connections, the most spectacular of which, collaboration on a project to produce a nuclear bomb ..."

(Mr. Shaheed, Syrian Arab Republic)

(continued in Arabic)

He goes on to ask:

(spoke in English)

"Why did Israel engage in this diplomatically dicey "special relationship"? A former Israeli official told Seymour Hirsch it was because South Africa was rich in raw materials, notably uranium, iron ore and coal, because, as the official said, 'try to do a nuclear test in Israel and all hell breaks loose', and because "they are also European settlers standing against a hostile world,'" ...

(continued in Arabic)

And Mr. Cortin goes on to ask once again:

(spoke in English)

"What has South Africa gained? The much-vaunted South African arms industry would have been a shadow of what it is without Israeli know-how. The Israelis contributed significantly to the development of an effective killing machine that was turned against South Africa's neighbouring States and the opponents of apartheid within the country."

(continued in Arabic)

The American writer I have just mentioned, Mr. Seymour Hirsch, author of The Samson Option, affirms that there are six or seven secret military and nuclear notes of understanding between Israel and South Africa.

If we take into account, in this context, the special nature of the two regimes in South Africa and in Israel, it becomes quite evident that their efforts to acquire and develop weapons of mass destruction do not arise from

(Mr. Shaheed, Syrian Arab Republic)

any defensive concept, as in the case of other countries, but, rather, from aggressive, expansionist concepts that aim at entrenching their aggression and imposing faits accomplis with the force of arms.

This sinister alliance between South Africa and Israel continues to grow stronger from one day to the next. Recently, it has become public to an unprecedented degree. On 10 November 1991, De Klerk, accompanied by a large delegation that included Botha, his Foreign Minister, paid an official three-day visit to Tel Aviv, during which he met with top Israeli officials. In the course of the visit, Pretoria's Foreign Minister Botha admitted that the two parties had collaborated in the military sphere up until 1987, since which year, he claimed, "no military contracts had been signed". He also claimed that their "relations were not going to be based on military cooperation but, rather, on industrial, commercial and economic exchanges".

In turn, Tel Aviv's rulers have claimed that they have not signed any new military agreements with South Africa since 1987, when they purportedly froze their relations with South Africa. However, they emphasized their continued commitment to agreements previously signed, agreements that will expire, they claim, at the end of next year. The Israeli newspaper Ha'aretz estimates the annual value of the economic cooperation between the two regimes at approximately $800 million.

At the conclusion of his visit, on 13 November 1991, De Klerk held a press conference at which he refused to speak about the collaboration between the regimes in the nuclear and military fields. With regard to Pretoria's drive to break out of the isolation imposed upon it as a result of its racist

(Mr. Shaheed, Syrian Arab Republic)

policies, De Klerk stated that "there was no contradiction between the establishment of good relations with the Arab world and the relations that have long existed with the Hebrew State". Naturally, the future will reveal the true nature of the agreements signed and the effects of such agreements in promoting further the relations of the two regimes.

In light of the facts concerning the close relationship between Pretoria and Tel Aviv, one is truly bewildered at the audacity of the representative of Israel in deciding to participate in a debate on apartheid. In that debate he made a statement in his usual manner, one filled with deceit, distortion and fabrication on a level that would arouse the envy of a Goebbels. The African majority, the legitimate owners of the land and its wealth, have in his opinion become a mere "community", just as the Palestinian people are "Arab Palestinians" and the occupied Arab territories have become mere "territories". The word, incidentally, was first used in South Africa to distinguished between first-class citizens and so-called "non-citizens". Zionism, whose true nature was defined by General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX), has, in his opinion, become a model to be followed by many liberation movements.

That representative, who for many years has reaffirmed the non-existence of any military relationship with South Africa and maintained that only relatively minimal economic relations existed (A/45/PV.57) yesterday tried, with his usual audacity, to convince us that relations between Israel and South Africa have overnight reached the point at which high-level visits are being exchanged and that such relations are quite natural - disregarding, as

(Mr. Shaheed, Syrian Arab Republic)

usual, the many resolutions adopted by the United Nations.

This collaboration of which the representative of Israel now speaks freely cannot be passed over in silence. Its dangers cannot be minimized by the waving of slogans in this forum by the representatives of that racist regime with regard to human rights, equality, justice, democracy and the like. The purely gratuitous sentiments expressed to our African brothers while true support is being given the racist Government of South Africa only serve to reaffirm the inability of that racist regime to break free from the interests that bind it to the racist regime in Pretoria and its inability to participate effectively with the other members of the international community in putting an end to the worst of all crimes against humanity or to commit itself in deed, and not in words, to human rights, justice and equality.

Suffice it to recall here that when, on the night of 20 March 1990 the entire world celebrated the independence of Namibia, invitations were sent out to all States Members of the Organization to attend that celebration with the single exception of Israel. Need we ask the reason for that seeming insult?

In spite of the abrogation of the basic legal underpinnings of the odious system of apartheid, it still exists in practice. The African majority continues to be denied its legitimate rights for purely racial reasons.

(Mr. Shaheed, Syrian Arab Republic)

As stated in the preliminary report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Southern Africa:

> "a complex system such as apartheid, which has created a systematic and institutionalized system of racial discrimination, cannot be abrogated by mere acts of legislation. Much more must be done at the economic, educational and political levels and in regard to administrative structures. South African society as a whole faces the enormous task of fighting the racial prejudice and discriminatory atmosphere that infuse all levels of public life". (A/46/401, para. 36)

In the light of all this, it would be an act of self-deception to think that the situation now prevailing in South Africa indicates the real end of the odious system of apartheid. The African majority still needs to make great sacrifices in order to achieve its legitimate objectives. The cosmetic treatment of the image of the racist regime aims basically at breaking the international isolation imposed on the De Klerk South African Government.

Since De Klerk declared his intention to repeal the apartheid laws, a few countries have hastened to lift sanctions in breach of the United Nations Declaration adopted by consensus on 14 December 1989. The changes that have taken place fall short of the desired goal and cannot be considered as irreversible.

In that regard, we cannot but express our concern at the increasing tendency towards the premature lifting of sanctions, which would only result in easing the pressure on the racist Government of South Africa. This pressure has proven to be indispensible if an end is to be put to apartheid in legislative and practical terms so that a united, democratic and non-racial South Africa may emerge.

(Mr. Shaheed, Syrian Arab Republic)

That is why Syria continues to hold the view that, more than ever before, the international community must continue its international measures, including sanctions against the racist regime of South Africa. It would appear that the De Klerk Government will continue to drag its feet concerning the dismantling of the racist regime and the achievement of a settlement with the African majority in order to completely break the isolation and to lift the sanctions that have been internationally imposed against it.

Finally, my country, one of the founding Members of the United Nations, reaffirms its support for and solidarity with the struggling African majority in its legitimate fight against the worst crime that can be committed against humanity. We are confident that all forms of racism and racial discrimination are doomed to fizzle out and disappear. The South African writer Nadine Gordimer, a member of the white minority, has discovered that were she to cling to her membership her life would be narrow and practically meaningless. She found her true path by repudiating the policies and ideas of racial discrimination. She has spontaneously given expression to the collective experience of the African majority with all its anguish and all its aspirations.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members that tomorrow afternoon - in addition to considering agenda item 29, "The situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security"; agenda item 31, "The situation in Central America: threats to international peace and security and peace initiatives"; agenda item 34, "Cooperation between the

(The President)

United Nations and the League of Arab States"; and agenda item 40, "Question of peace, stability and cooperation in South-East Asia" - the Assembly will also consider a report of the Second Committee on agenda item 12, "Report of the Economic and Social Council", as the first item.

AGENDA ITEMS 37 AND 102 (continued)

POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA

(a) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID (A/46/22)

(b) REPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL GROUP TO MONITOR THE SUPPLY AND SHIPPING OF OIL AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS TO SOUTH AFRICA (A/46/44)

(c) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/46/499, A/46/507, A/46/648)

(d) REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/46/643)

(e) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/46/L.31)

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA

(a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/46/561)

(b) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/46/L.25)

Mr. WALKER (Jamaica): In 1963, one year after Jamaica gained its independence and became a Member of the United Nations, the Government pledged before the General Assembly that Jamaica would cooperate with its friends in Africa, to the best of its ability, to see the shameful system of apartheid removed from the continent which gave us the majority of our ancestors. Today, 28 years later, there is now at long last evidence that the patient and persistent struggle of the oppressed majority of the people of South Africa, with the support of the international community, will result in the dismantling of apartheid and the creation of a democratic society in South Africa.

(Mr. Walker, Jamaica)

Since President De Klerk took office there has been progress towards a changed society in Africa. The process of change gained momentum with the release of Nelson Mandela on 11 February 1990. We were privileged to listen to this distinguished, courageous and outstanding leader on 22 June 1990 and again yesterday in this Assembly. In July this year, the Government and the people of Jamaica were proud and honoured to welcome Nelson Mandela to our shores. This historic visit enabled us to express our overwhelming admiration and affection for this truly great man and to assure him personally of our strong and continued support for his efforts to end apartheid through peaceful negotiations.

Yesterday, the President of the African National Congress, in a moving and wide-ranging address, outlined for us his vision of the emerging new South Africa, the current political and economic situation in his country, the nature of the further support required from the international community in relation to sanctions and the socio-economic transformation of South Africa, and the prerequisites for demolishing the system of apartheid and achieving a genuinely democratic, non-racial South Africa.

(Mr. Walker, Jamaica)

My Government welcomes the developments which have culminated this year in the repeal of legislation that constituted the formal framework and the main pillars of the apartheid system. We have noted the progress made in meeting the requirements of the United Nations Declaration on apartheid adopted by consensus in December 1989. In particular we welcome the agreement signed by the South African Government and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees which, we hope, will lead to the resettlement of all political exiles, and in his address Mr. Mandela sought the assistance of the international community.

We regret that progress has been impeded by the excalating violence which could be a serious threat to the process of change and the preparations for negotiations. The violence which mainly affects the black majority has increased despite the National Peace Accord signed by the Government, the African National Congress and the Inkatha Freedom Party in September. It is our hope that the Government will honour its commitments regarding impartial investigations into the sources of violence and that violence will not be allowed to frustrate arrangements for negotiations.

The programme of constitutional reform proposed by President de Klerk, although still far short of the ultimate objective of full representational democracy, at least provides a basis for beginning negotiations. We welcome the progress being made in preparing for these negotiations. We were pleased with the formation of the Patriotic United Front comprising some 90 anti-apartheid organizations, which at their meeting in Durban in October pledged to work together to seize this moment in history to ensure the speedy establishment of democracy and called for the holding of an all-party congress

(Mr. Walker, Jamaica)

to set in motion the process leading to a democratically elected constituent assembly to affect the transfer of power. We are glad to note that the process was taken a significant step further at a meeting in Johannesburg at which the Government, the African National Congress and other political parties completed preparations for the convention for a democratic South Africa to be convened on 21-22 December 1991.

Some countries have responded to the changes that have occurred and to the positive developments that have taken place by the lifting of sanctions against South Africa in varying degrees. We believe that some of these steps are premature and we naturally support the measured and balanced approach adopted by the Commonwealth Heads of Government at their recent meeting in Harare. In recognition of the crucial role sanctions have played in bringing about the changes thus far, they agreed to continue to use effective forms of pressure to assure a successful final outcome to the conflict in South Africa, linking any change in the application of different categories of sanctions to the taking of real and practical steps to end apartheid.

It was agreed that one category - "people-to-people" sanctions in areas such as cultural and sporting contacts, tourism and air links - should be lifted immediately in recognition of changes that have taken place so far. In the area of international sports, one in which Jamaica played a major role in the ostracizing of South Africa, the Commonwealth Heads of Government were encouraged by the recent considerable progress in the evolution of a unified and non-racial sports movement in South Africa. They agreed to continue to encourage these developments and where appropriate to provide assistance. The Commonwealth Heads of Government also agreed that restrictions should be

(Mr. Walker, Jamaica)

lifted in particular sports, where it is confirmed that the sport has been integrated, that it has been readmitted by the relevant international governing body and that the non-racial sporting body in South Africa has agreed to participate.

As regards other sanctions it was overwhelmingly agreed that these should be phased out as follows: trade and investment measures should be lifted when appropriate transitional mechanisms have been agreed that would enable all the parties to participate fully and effectively in negotiations; financial sanctions - the most effective sanctions - should be lifted only when agreement is reached on the text of a new democratic constitution, unless contrary arrangements are mutually agreed; and, finally, the arms embargo should remain in force until the new post-apartheid South African Government is firmly established with full democratic control and accountability.

The approach to sanctions taken by the Commonwealth Heads of Government is consistent with that of the Special Committee against Apartheid. In its report, the Committee states that apartheid will be considered dead only after transitional arrangements have been established, a new consitution adopted and a new Government installed after the holding of free and fair elections. The Committee also recommends that the international community should continue to exert pressure on the South African regime, the exact nature of which should be concomitant with developments in the country as collectively perceived. It also agreed that random lifting of sanctions is premature and deprives the international community of its leverage and its ability to promote progress in the negotiating process.

This phase-by-phase approach to sanctions was strongly emphasized yesterday by Mr. Mandela in his address. He stressed the need for continued

(Mr. Walker, Jamaica)

international pressure and urged that sanctions should be lifted only in phases corresponding to the actual progress achieved within South Africa.

Seeing that it is the force of international pressure that has helped to bring change to South Africa, let us continue the pressure until we achieve the goal of the eradication of apartheid and the establishment of a free, democratic, non racial and prosperous South Africa.

Mr. AKSIN (Turkey): We meet again in regular session to consider the item on the apartheid policies of the Government of South Africa. This item has been on the agenda of the United Nations for many years and each year the international community addresses it with renewed enthusiasm and determination. The international community feels that it has a special responsibility to assist the people of South Africa in their struggle against apartheid. The active participation of delegations in this year's debate confirms this observation. Indeed, the international community has been waiting for the day when all South Africans, regardless of their race, will enjoy equality, justice and full political rights and it is determined to contribute to the realization of these aspirations.

Since our last meeting in this Assembly on the subject, important progress has been made in the process of ending apartheid and initiating negotiations on a new constitution. The repeal of the basic laws of the apartheid system, namely, the Land Acts, the Group Areas Act and the Population Registration Act, as well as the amendment of the Internal Security Act, are an important milestone in this process. Even though the practical effects of this repeal may still appear to be limited, the abrogation of these basic laws has deprived the abhorrent system of racial discrimination of its main pillars.

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

The adoption of a new constitution which will open the way to a free, democratic and non-racial South Africa will be the decisive step in dismantling apartheid. All of the political forces of South Africa should take full advantage of the existing possibilities as well as of the support of the international community to transform this country into a genuinely democratic, non-racial society. In this framework, we welcome the holding of a Patriotic/United Front Conference last October. The Joint Approach on the Constitutional Process reached between the African National Congress (ANC), the Pan-Africanist Congress (PAC), trade unions and other organizations and the convergence of views of the leading political forces on the basic principles of a new constitution are very promising steps. We hope that the meeting of all concerned parties to start negotiations on constitutional issues and on transitional arrangements will be held before the end of 1991. The holding last week of the Preparatory Meeting to the Convention for a Democratic South Africa was the most encouraging step in this direction.

The continuing political violence remains a source of deep concern. Such violence is an important obstacle to the creation of a climate conducive to negotiations on a new constitution and an impediment to the free exercise of political activity. It is a serious problem which will affect the future of South Africa on its way to democratization. The information given by the Secretary-General in his second progress report fully reflects the seriousness of the situation. As many as 3,000 persons have been killed between July 1990 and June 1991 and 45,000 others displaced as a result of violence. Although the Government has announced a series of measures to curb the violence, we believe that the South African authorities should adopt a more resolute

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

attitude in this regard to ensure the success of the process that has been initiated. The National Peace Accord signed by 22 political parties and organizations, including the South African authorities, as well as the ANC and the PAC, is the most significant development to end the violence. Its effective implementation will be crucial in creating the mutual confidence and trust which are prerequisites for the establishment of a framework for peaceful change.

We are concerned that the release of political prisoners continues to be a source of controversy in the discussions between the political forces of the country. While a large number of political prisoners have been released, there is no consensus on whether all political prisoners have been freed. There is still much that remains to be done in the area of defining political prisoners. The issue of the release of the political prisoners is one of the main elements of the United Nations Declaration on Apartheid of 1989 as well as of the Groote Schuur and Pretoria Minutes. This issue requires special attention and has priority among the subjects that need to be addressed. We believe that the procedure envisaged by the Secretary-General in his report (A/45/1052), which calls for the establishment and checking of one list of alleged political detainees and for referring disputed cases to a panel of independent experts, can be seen as a realistic option.

But the picture is not completely gloomy. We welcome the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding between the South African authorities and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees which, with its full implementation, will mark the beginning of a new era in this country. This should lead to the early return of the exiles and refugees.

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

The international community has always condemned apartheid for being nothing less than institutionalized racial segregation which contravenes all basic and universal human values. We have always underlined that apartheid cannot be reformed but only dismantled. We have called for the realization of this objective by peaceful means. Today, this Assembly can take justifiable pride in seeing that its long-standing calls have found an echo in South Africa and that the creation of a non-racial, democratic and free South Africa is well on the way towards realization.

The Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, His Excellency Mr. Ibrahim Gambari, was right when he emphasized in his introductory statement that there is an imperative need for the international community to remain seized with the question of apartheid and to remain vigilant in the political process. Even the long list of speakers for our three-day debate demonstrates the abiding keen interest of the international community in the successful outcome of the ongoing political process. We are convinced that the community will continue to support all the encouraging developments leading towards the building of a new society in South Africa which will guarantee all its people the same fundamental rights and freedoms. We also believe that the international community will not fail to congratulate all the parties involved for their realism and the courage they have displayed in pursuing the process of ending apartheid once and for all.

Mr. KHAMSY (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (interpretation from French): Ever since the apartheid system became a State institution, the United Nations has redoubled its efforts to mobilize international support to

(Mr. Khamsy, Lao People's Democratic Republic)

put an end to that obnoxious system practised by the Government of South Africa. The Organization has achieved a historic victory in that struggle for human dignity, justice and freedom when, in December 1989, the sixteenth special session of the General Assembly adopted, by consensus, the wide-ranging Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa, which set forth the principles, programme of action and guidelines for the negotiating process to follow in order to reach a political settlement of the question of South Africa. Furthermore, it is gratifying to note that the Declaration and its accompanying programme of action have been reaffirmed by resolutions, likewise adopted by consensus, in September and December last year.

The basic question now is clearly not whether the apartheid laws in South Africa will disappear or not, but rather has to do with the creation of a unified, non-racial and democratic South Africa where everyone can enjoy the same rights of citizenship and nationality on an equal footing, and where everyone will have the right to participate in the government and administration of the country on the basis of universal equal suffrage.

Today, the possibility of a new South Africa remains more real than ever before. The second progress report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the Declaration of the United Nations, contained in document A/45/1052, encourages us to face the future with a certain degree of optimism which is furthermore confirmed by the words spoken yesterday from this very rostrum by Mr. Nelson Mandela, President of the African National Congress of

(Mr. Khamsy, Lao People's Democratic Republic)

South Africa (ANC). Recent events and changes, foremost among which was the repeal of the latest series of laws underpinning apartheid, that is the Land Acts, the Group Areas Act and the Population Registration Act, were important milestones along the road towards the total eradication of apartheid. Important legal structures have been eliminated, according to the South African authorities, which stated that:

> "'more than a hundred discriminatory laws and regulations were abolished over the past 12 months'." (A/45/1052, para. 73)

(Mr. Khamsy, Lao People's Democratic Republic)

Several measures necessary for a climate conducive to negotiations as well as peace initiatives have been undertaken. More than a thousand political prisoners were released last year, although hundreds are still in gaol. According to the agreement reached between the Government of South Africa and the High Commissioner for Refugees, the general amnesty guaranteeing repatriation for political exiles, is now in force. Protection of human rights in a future democratic South Africa apparently is supported by consensus.

Another striking event was the signing of the National Peace Accord on 14 September 1991 to allow the convening shortly of a multi-party conference in an environment of confidence and security. And so, to sum up, there is already a climate of political activity conducive to the convening of such a conference which would involve the participation of all parties and political groups to negotiate a new constitution.

My delegation believes, therefore, that the recent positive changes we have witnessed so far provide a sufficiently solid basis for continuous progress towards the complete abolition of that regime and we wish to reaffirm our full support for all the peaceful efforts that can contribute to the achievement of that ultimate goal.

As is clear from the Secretary-General's report, however, many obstacles lie in the path of salvation. Measures enunciated in the Declaration are taking a long time to be implemented and the process has encountered serious difficulties in recent months. Acts of violence between factions are constantly being committed in the townships and an atmosphere of instability

(Mr. Khamsy, Lao People's Democratic Republic)

has been created which is in jarring contradiction with the climate of hope created by the abolition of the apartheid laws. The reports stresses with deep concern that:

> "... the wave of violence that engulfed the country during the period became a severe test of confidence and a serious obstacle to the evolving political dialogue." (A/45/1052, para. 6)

While we recognize that the pillars of apartheid have been abolished, the Secretary-General points out that:

> "... concomitant attitudes and practices, as indeed the consequences of those laws, do persist." (ibid, para. 8)

He rightly stresses that delays in the implementation of the measures necessary to create a climate for negotiations:

> "... particularly with regard to political prisoners and exiles, the perceived ineffectual response to violence and disclosures of secret funding of organizations led to tensions and a crisis of confidence in the government structures." (ibid)

South Africa is now experiencing a period of extreme political fragility. With real prospects for change, this new political situation is not so much the result of the subjective desire of the Pretoria regime as it is the result of objective facts reflected in the struggle waged by the anti-apartheid forces in the country and internationally. At a time when there are hopeful signs that there will be a new era in South Africa, it would, in my delegation's opinion, be an illusion to believe that the lifting of sanctions could lead to any rapid change in this system of Government by the white minority. Heightened vigilance on the part of the international

(Mr. Khamsy, Lao People's Democratic Republic)

community is still necessary in bringing pressure to bear on the regime, particularly by means of economic and financial sanctions, until a truly, non-racial society can be established.

My delegation believes that the strict and complete implementation of the provisions of the Declaration adopted at the sixteenth special session of the General Assembly is the only way to achieve that goal.

Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana): Twenty-two months ago South Africa embarked on a journey it had never thought it would ever embark on. The outset of the journey was dramatic and proclamatory in its suddenness; it was epoch-making and cataclysmic in its implication and import. Was it the death knell of the ogre of apartheid that was being sounded or was it one of those desert mirages Southern Africa is famous for?

In an important sense South Africa is today different from what it was 22 months ago. It is still, in parts, a bitterly divided and strife-torn country and yet it is also a country in the throes of a painful, albeit rather confused transformation, but transformation none the less. The so-called pillars of apartheid, the Group Areas Act and the Land Acts, have been abolished and the Population Act has been subsantially amended and yet apartheid and its consequences remain an entrenched feature of South African society. Understandly so, for whoever said that the mere abolition of apartheid laws is organically analogous to instant and automatic creation of an egalitarian, non-racial society in South Africa?

With the convening last week of an all-party preparatory meeting to prepare the stage for the convening of the convention for a democratic South Africa three weeks hence, we take a lot of comfort in the hope, if not the

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

belief, that the negotiating process for a new constitutional dispensation in South Africa is about to begin in earnest. From the vantage point of the United Nations it appears that the leaders of South Africa, irrespective of race, colour and creed, have at long last found some common ground on the basis of which they are now ready - at least they appear to be ready - to walk hand-in-hand into the future as one nation, one people, unriven by destructive considerations of race and racism.

The moment of truth has arrived for all South Africans. Apartheid is not dead just because the Government has abolished the laws that have underpinned its pervasive reign for so many decades. The endemic violence now threatening to bleed the urban areas to death is daily reminding us of this fact - the fact that the roots of apartheid are too deep to rot away instantly at the stroke of a pen.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

The final demise of apartheid will occur only under the weight of a new South Africa, when all South Africans, regardless of race, colour or creed, have been enfranchised and thus empowered to design, as free men and women, a political order or system under which they have freely chosen to live. That is why we lay so much store on the character of the transformation from the old South Africa to the new. That is why we are so driven to agitate unceasingly for the urgent commencement of the negotiations for a new democratic constitutional dispensation.

There is no other way to South Africa's salvation than through the crafting of a Constitution that would not merely modify racial domination by the minority but one that would be designed to uproot lock, stock and barrel all vestiges of apartheid from every sphere of South African life.

In this context we are impelled to judge the constitutional proposals announced by the parties to the South African conflict in the past few months. Are these proposals designed to make a clear, categorical and terminal break with the apartheid past, or do they - or some of them - seek to delay or postpone the inevitable and give us half a solution to the South African problem? We certainly hope not.

What we have always sought - what the international community has always sought and struggled for - is the creation in South Africa of a non-racial democracy born of unqualified and undiluted adult suffrage. One of the basic ingredients of the National Party's version of a participatory democracy is freedom from domination. In other words, the National Party, which is the ruling party in South Africa, seeks to negotiate a democratic system that is free from domination even if such a system is based on one-man, one-vote -

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

on adult suffrage. We have no problem with such a system unless "free from domination", in a one-man, one-vote situation in South Africa, is a code expression for something else - something short of the majority rule we expect in that country.

In a true democracy participation by all in the democratic process is a given. Every adult has the right to vote, to run for office, or to refuse to run for office, to join a political party of his or her choice, or to elect not to join any party at all, and so forth. In other words, we understand every true democracy to be participatory because of the inalienable freedoms of choice, speech and conscience which underpin such a democracy.

Without any prejudice to the right of the people of South Africa to devise a system tailored to their own needs, as defined by them, we are struck by the obsession in the National Party's constitutional proposals with the logical implications of the one-man, one-vote principle in the South African context. The proposal on the character of the Executive Authority envisaged by the National Party bears this out incontrovertibly. The nub of the proposal is that:

"the executive should not be constituted from one party alone, but from members of a number of the major parties".

What is being proposed here is that a new South Africa should be ruled by constitutionally determined coalition governments regardless of the outcome of democratic elections. The presidency should be collective regardless of the outcome of a democratic election. The Constitution must provide for this system of collective or multi-party government, not the elections, as such. The parties are not to decide of their own volition to coalesce to form a

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

government of national unity. It must be demanded of them by the Constitution regardless of the outcome of the one-man, one-vote elections.

We are very conscious of the fact that these are probably only proposals intended for debate before and at the negotiating table. It is to be hoped that they are not set in iron or rock, but are negotiable maximalist positions of a political party in dread of losing power at long last. And yet, it must be stated quite emphatically that there can be no final solution to the problem of apartheid in South Africa without the consummation of majority rule as a logical consequence of the deracialization of the electoral franchise in that country. A constitutional artifice which continues to negate this fact would not last.

We also hope that the three-tier system of government proposed by the National Party that "takes account of the rich diversity of the population of South Africa ..." is more innocent than it sounds. For it would be tragic if taking account of the rich diversity of the South African population turns out to be a contrivance to perpetuate the racial and ethnic compartmentalization of South African society. What a new South Africa needs is unity and cohesion, not continued racial truncation and polarization in a different guise.

While on the whole we are encouraged by the progress that has been made so far in the past 22 months in the tortuous and complex rehearsals for constitutional negotiations, we nevertheless continue to be pained by the unrelenting violence being perpetrated against train passengers and funeral gatherers in the urban areas of South Africa by an assortment of murderous thugs of undetermined identity, we are told. Even as we commend the wisdom of

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

the leaders not to be deterred by the violence but to proceed with preparations for negotiations, we must at the same time urge both the South African Government and the black leaders to redouble their efforts to stamp out the violence and to create conditions for negotiations in a tranquil environment. The Government has the primary responsibility to maintain law and order and maintain it efficiently and humanely. Every leader in South Africa also has a duty to contribute to a solution to the violence, for no party can gain from it.

Six weeks ago a Patriotic Front of the disenfranchised was formed by the African National Congress, the Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania and others. The Patriotic Front was formed in readiness for the commencement of the all-party negotiations. There is nothing sinister about it. We welcomed it because we believe unity on the part of the victims of apartheid is crucial if the momentous negotiations for a new South Africa are to be orderly, meaningful and successful in the shortest time possible. The Front is certainly not what its detractors say it is - a ganging up of the blacks against the whites. We need unity of purpose among so many fractious political parties if we are to avoid anarchy at the negotiating table. The international community is therefore duty-bound to encourage such unity of purpose.

Finally, the role of the international community in the whole process of negotiation in South Africa cannot be gainsaid. We are not asking the international community to meddle in the negotiations - which are the exclusive prerogative of the South African people - but it is our contention

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

that the United Nations and the world community at large cannot abandon South Africans in their hour of need to their own uncertain devices. Support - constructive and non-intrusive support - for the negotiating process at every stage is essential.

(Mr. Legwaila, Botswana)

It is also important that pressure be maintained throughout the process to nudge the negotiations forward and, in particular, to ensure that the South African Government shall deliver on its commitments to real and meaningful change in South Africa.

On both sides of the South African racial divide there are polarizing fundamentalist forces implacably opposed to the negotiating process for one ideological or racist reason or another. But what is most ominous, President De Klerk, a man of undoubted courage and realism, faces on his side of the racial divide a small but vicious coterie of anti-change die-hards who have vowed to resort to the desperate weapon of violence to abort the birth of a new South Africa in order to preserve apartheid. The international community must leave these desperate elements in no doubt as to the consequences of their actions - President De Klerk should be encouraged to resist them and pressure must continuously be brought to bear on his Goverment not to capitulate to their evil designs.

Mr. KALPAGE (Sri Lanka): The delegation of Sri Lanka is pleased to note the progress made in the past year in the implementation of the Declaration on Apartheid and Its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa, adopted by consensus in the General Assembly on 14 December 1989.

The Secretary-General, in his second progress report on the implementation of the Declaration, has reported that "over the last 12 months the process towards the end of apartheid in South Africa, although halting, remained on course" (A/45/1052, para. 6). However, this activity has been affected by the persisting political violence.

The reports of the Special Committee against Apartheid for the period from October 1990 to October 1991 refer to the overall progress made in

(Mr. Kalpage, Sri Lanka)

South Africa in the process of ending apartheid and towards negotiations on a new constitution. While deploring the violence which has become a destabilizing factor in that process, the Special Committee regards the adoption of the National Peace Accord in September 1991 by the South African authorities, the African National Congress and the Inkatha Freedom Party, among others, as having "generated hopes for peace and reconciliation".

In this context, revelations of covert government funding of political organizations and mounting reports of the involvement of elements within the security forces in perpetrating acts of violence must be viewed with grave concern. The full implementation of the National Peace Accord as quickly as possible is much to be desired.

We note with satisfaction the progress made towards creating a climate for negotiations. The release of political prisoners and the return to South Africa of political exiles are important in this regard. Some of the other measures conducive to creating conditions for a climate of negotiations are: the removal of all bans and restrictions on proscribed and restricted organizations and persons, the removal of troops from the townships, the lifting of the state of emergency and the repeal of legislation designed to circumscribe political activity and the cessation of political trials.

In the meanwhile, in order that the people themselves may participate in the remaking of their country, the necessary climate should be created for free political discussion to take place. Freedom from violence, freedom of assembly and freedom of the press are three essential ingredients for free political discussion and activity.

(Mr. Kalpage, Sri Lanka)

We recognize that since June 1990, the Government of South Africa has enacted important measures towards dismantling the basic laws of apartheid - the so-called pillars of apartheid. However, much remains to be done in the implementation of such legislative measures as have been enacted. This implementation should be effected without delay.

The Declaration on Apartheid and Its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa has set out the guidelines to the process of negotiations in South Africa. The principles envisaged in a new constitution have been outlined. We note that representatives of political organizations have concluded preparations for a formal convention to be held on 20 December to debate the future of South Africa. The December convention holds out the promise that negotiations have really begun for the dismantling of white minority rule.

We have noted the statement made by Mr. Nelson Mandela, President of the African National Congress in this Assembly yesterday. It is our view that sanctions should be lifted in phases corresponding to actual progress towards democratization being achieved within South Africa. In this connection, we recall the sanctions policy against South Africa adopted by the Commonwealth Heads of Government at Harare in October this year. Sri Lanka supports this policy fully.

We agree that South Africa would require the support of the international community in order to implement a programme of socio-economic changes which would contribute to mitigating the destructive consequences of apartheid. Assistance would be required for the resettlement of repatriated exiles. The human resource development needs of post-apartheid South Africa should also be addressed.

(Mr. Kalpage, Sri Lanka)

The General Assembly of the United Nations has played a historic role in removing apartheid from South Africa. It should now look ahead to the post-apartheid period when, as we all hope, a non-racial, democratic, united and non-fragmented South Africa will be reinstated in the community of nations.

Mr. SARDENBERG (Brazil): As a country whose roots and national soul are to be found in diversity, in the mixture of different peoples and races from all over the world, Brazil repudiates, in no uncertain terms, all forms and manifestations of racial intolerance. The Brazilian Constitution defines the practice of racism as a crime of the utmost gravity, for which no bail can be accepted. Accordingly, at the international level, Brazil has consistently added its voice to the many that, for the last few decades, have denounced and condemned apartheid.

Furthermore, the close ties - historical, cultural, economic and political - that link Brazil to the African continent, and to southern Africa in particular, have contributed to an even more acute perception of the intolerable situation generated by the apartheid system, a system based on the indefensible denial of basic human and political rights to the majority of the people of South Africa.

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

Last August, my country was honoured by the visit of Mr. Nelson Mandela, President of the African National Congress. It was a memorable occasion. With his unique and impressive combination of gentleness and firmness of principle, Mr. Mandela for ever captured the hearts and minds of the Brazilian people. In September, President Fernando Collor made an official visit to Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe and Namibia, making manifest the desire of the Brazilian Government to strengthen further the relations of friendship and cooperation with those southern African countries.

Our keen interest and sincere concerns about the rapidly evolving situation in South Africa have still another regional dimension. Since the establishment in 1986 of the Zone of Peace and Cooperation of the South Atlantic, the countries of the region, neighbours from Africa and South America, have time and again expressed the hope that they will be able to welcome into the community of States of the Zone in the near future a democratic, united and non-racial South Africa.

Brazil believes in the purposefulness of the Zone of Peace and Cooperation of the South Atlantic and spares no effort in helping to advance its objectives. In that connection, my delegation is convinced that the future incorporation into the Zone of a democratic South Africa, free from apartheid, is highly desirable and will significantly contribute to the enhancement of our common endeavours in the South Atlantic region.

It is therefore with high expectations that Brazil has been following the evolution of the political process in South Africa. Up to now, the results have been at once encouraging and insufficient. No matter how tortuous and how beset with obstacles the road may still be for South Africa, there is room for optimism, because the ongoing process shows that the most representative parties have chosen the appropriate way to pursue the quest for a brighter and

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

a more just future for the country: by peaceful means, through dialogue and direct negotiations.

In the last few months, a series of auspicious developments gave grounds for some degree of understandable expectation: the repeal of some of the basic laws of apartheid, the intense political activity of previously banned organizations, the signing of the National Peace Accord, the holding of the Patriotic/United Front Conference, the agreement between the South African Government and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees on the process of the return of political refugees and exiles to South Africa, the broad consensus that human rights must be protected and the convening of the convention for a democratic South Africa, to be held later this month. All these are steps in the right direction, the direction of frank and extensive negotiations towards transitional arrangements leading to the elaboration and adoption of a new constitution and ultimately to the achievement of a truly united, democratic and non-racial South Africa, the direction that will bring South Africa back to the community of nations.

Notwithstanding the considerable progress witnessed in South Africa, there can be no doubt that much remains to be achieved and that many obstacles, including legal ones, still hinder the ongoing process of change. The greatest of those obstacles are the persistence of political violence and the delays affecting the release of all political prisoners. The disclosure that public funds have secretly been used to finance selected political organizations is also a matter of concern.

Added to all those aspects, and also in need of being properly addressed, is the question of the deep-rooted socio-economic inequalities afflicting large segments of South African society, which are among the bleakest legacies of decades of segregation and apartheid. Here the international community has

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

a particularly important role to play, a role bound to increase as the process of change continues to advance in the way we all hope it will.

The situation in South Africa has undoubtedly undergone important modifications since the adoption two years ago of the consensus Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa (A/RES/S-16/1). It would be premature to celebrate the eradication of apartheid, just as it would be unreasonable to deny that far-reaching changes are clearly on their way in South Africa. What once were perceived as merely dreams are now moving closer to reality, as negotiations, though halting at times, keep moving ahead.

The present process would not have been possible without the concerted efforts of the international community and the untiring efforts of the United Nations. In that context, a special tribute should be rendered to the Special Committee against Apartheid and to its indefatigable Chairman, Ambassador Ibrahim Gambari of Nigeria. Now, as Ambassador Gambari himself so aptly pointed out in his introductory statement "the international community has to remain engaged" in order to continue to monitor and assess future developments in the South African political situation. Moreover, as stressed by a number of South African democratic leaders, it must search for the correct balance between the maintenance of pressure and the encouragement of the process of change, including a carefully considered phasing-out of the sanctions, directly linked to and predicated upon the realization of effective progress on the negotiating front.

Never since the issue of the apartheid policies of the Government of South Africa was first included in our agenda has the General Assembly had the opportunity to discuss it against such a challenging background. The complex and often troublesome process of dismantling the apartheid system has moved forward, and so have the negotiations towards the definition of transitional

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

arrangements and a new constitutional order that will grant equal rights to all South Africans. The progress achieved so far is encouraging. It should inspire the international community to reaffirm its commitment and to redouble its efforts to consolidate irreversible change in South Africa.

Mr. KARUKUBIRO KAMUNANWIRE (Uganda): Allow me to pay a well-deserved tribute to Ambassador Gambari of Nigeria, Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, for the effective leadership he has given the Committee. My appreciation goes equally to the members of the Committee. They have made a commendable effort to galvanize the international community in the struggle against apartheid and the struggle for liberation in southern Africa. The report of the Committee (A/46/22) gives a good appraisal of developments and will be helpful in guiding the Assembly towards a course of action.

I wish also to express our gratitude to Ambassador Nyaki of Tanzania, Chairman of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa, and to Ambassador Huslid, Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Educational and Training Programmes, for lucidly presenting the reports of their respective Committees.

(Mr. Karukubiro Kamunanwire, Uganda)

The United Nations has, over the years, taken a principled stand against racism, of which apartheid is the worst manifestation. The question of apartheid is thus one of the most long-standing items on our agenda. The Special Committee, in particular, has worked tirelessly in mobilizing the international community's support in order to put in place, maintain and strengthen the necessary political and economic measures so as to force the Government of South Africa to put an end to apartheid. These measures, coupled with the liberation struggle of the South African patriots, are the ones that forced the Pretoria regime to embark on the tentative steps that could lead to the dismantling of the apartheid apparatus.

It is important that we continue to make a concerted effort to bring international pressure to bear against South Africa. A disorganized or reckless lifting of sanctions could easily be counterproductive and remove the incentive for the Government of South Africa to negotiate seriously in good faith. Sanctions play an essential part in ensuring the success of negotiations for the dismantling of apartheid. Yesterday, Mr. Nelson Mandela, the President of the African National Congress (ANC), articulated the importance of economic sanctions and the desire of the South African people that sanctions be maintained. It is only fitting that the international community heed their call.

It is worth reminding ourselves that our goal or objective in South Africa is the dismantling of apartheid with a view to achieving full respect for human rights and the establishment of a democratic and non-racial South Africa. The Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa, adopted by the General Assembly at its sixteenth special session (resolution S-16, annex), spells out the guidelines for negotiations and a programme of action. It calls on all countries and international

(Mr. Karukubiro Kamunanwire, Uganda)

organizations to adhere to that Programme of Action and to maintain existing measures against South Africa until there is clear evidence of profound and irreversible changes in that country.

Since the adoption of the Declaration two years ago, there have been a number of developments in South Africa. Notable among these were the release of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners, the lifting of restrictions on political organisations and the lifting of the state of emergency. We welcome the repeal of the Land Acts of 1913 and 1973, the Population Registration Act and the Group Areas Act, which were notorious and widely known as the pillars of the apartheid structure. We are happy to see that agreement has been reached and preparations are being made for the holding of multi-party talks which, we hope, will launch the negotiations on substantive issues concerning transitional arrangements and the constitution. These are positive developments that Members should encourage.

> We agree with the observation in the Special Committee's report that "there is a tendency to overrate the positive developments and to underestimate the seriousness of the remaining problems". (A/46/22, para. 117)

From the Secretary-General's report it is clear that, while some progress has been registered, the achievement of the final objective is far from being in sight.

There is an urgent need for the Government of South Africa to comply fully with all the provisions of the United Nations declarations and with agreements reached with the ANC contained in the Groote Schuur Minute of May 1990 and the Pretoria Minute of August 1990. The authorities have not fully complied with the requirement of releasing all political prisoners, including

(Mr. Karukubiro Kamunanwire, Uganda)

those in the Bantustans. Rather, the regime has engaged in dilatory tactics by releasing some political prisoners as part of the release of prisoners convicted of common crimes. This is unfortunate, for it sets the stage for right-wing extremists to perpetuate violence against the democratic forces and then claim political status for their members.

Uganda is very much concerned at the wave of violence in South Africa, which has caused much loss of lives and suffering among the people. It is clear that this violence has been targeted at ANC members and other democratic forces. This can only be aimed at destabilising the process of dismantling apartheid that is now in motion. The revelations regarding the involvement of elements of the South African security forces in acts of violence and the partisan position taken by the Government through its secret financial support of some political organizations raise doubts about its sincerity. It is our hope that the National Peace Accord, adopted in September 1991, will be implemented and help to bring violence to an end. This will make it possible for the South African people to focus on the most urgent task of bringing apartheid to a quick end.

I wish to underscore the special responsibility of the Government of South Africa to put an end to violence. As pointed out in the Special Committee's report:

> "Impartial and efficient action by the police might have curbed the violence that continued in Natal province and in the townships of Transvaal province." (ibid., para. 16)

Moreover, this wave of violence is a direct consequence of apartheid policies.

The mere repeal of some apartheid laws does not mean that apartheid has been eliminated. This repeal leaves in place the social and economic

(Mr. Karukubiro Kamunanwire, Uganda)

structures that apartheid has spent years constructing. Under the various land laws, millions of blacks were dispossessed of their land, uprooted and forcibly sent into barren areas without compensation. It therefore becomes imperative to put in place specific measures to redress these past injustices, including a land reform programme that provides for the restoration of land rights and compensation arrangements for past injustices. These measures should also be accompanied by affirmative actions aimed at emancipating the black majority by integrating it into the mainstream of economic and political activities. Failure to do so can only lay the foundation for the perpetuation of economic apartheid well after the implementation of the political changes for which we are striving. Uganda therefore appreciates the multilateral and bilateral education and training programmes for South Africans who clearly will play a vital role in post-apartheid South Africa.

(Mr. Karukubiro Kamunanwire, Uganda)

We regard it as unfortunate that the tentative steps taken by the South African Government have been used by some as justification for breaking the international consensus on sanctions. The road to the attainment of the goals of the Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa is still a very long one. Although there is a glimmer of hope, there are still very many hurdles, and the path is strewn with landmines. We are still at the critical initial stage of the negotiations. It is sanctions that have compelled the apartheid regime to accept the principle of negotiation, and, in our view, it is the fear of sanctions that will keep the South African Government at the negotiating table.

Sanctions should be maintained until the changes are profound and irreversible. But only when the apartheid constitution is scrapped and replaced by one that provides for the participation, on equal footing, of all the South African people will it be possible to regard the changes as profound and irreversible. The introduction of agreed transitional arrangements could indicate profound change, but the unilateral lifting of sanctions only undermines the global effort. The Organization of African Unity Ad Hoc Committee of Heads of State on Southern Africa, which met at Abuja, and the Commonwealth Heads of State and Government, at their Harare Summit, indicated the way forward in respect of this issue. The Harare Commonwealth Summit agreed to link the lifting of sanctions to specific progress in the negotiations and to the adoption of a democratic constitution in South Africa.

The General Assembly must reaffirm its support for the Declaration and must live up to its assertion that sanctions will have to be maintained until our objective is realized. Only such an unmistakable message will keep the South African Government at the negotiating table. Uganda, for its part, will continue, without any equivocation, to live up to this objective.

Mr. BREITENSTEIN (Finland): I make this intervention on behalf of the five Nordic countries - Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and my own country, Finland.

We in the Nordic countries have followed with keen interest the developments that have occurred in South Africa over the past 12 months. Fundamental changes have taken place. The Nordic countries commend the important and historic agreement to convene the Convention on a Democratic South Africa for the purpose of discussing South Africa's constitutional future and transitional arrangements to pave the way for the extension of full political rights to all South Africans. These steps deserve the full support and encouragement of the international community.

The Nordic countries regard it as encouraging that the South African Government has fulfilled its promises to abolish the apartheid legislation, exemplified by the Land and Group Areas Acts, the Separate Amenities Act and - the very foundation of the apartheid edifice - the Population Registration Act. Thus, with the important exception of the constitution itself, the formal basis of apartheid has, in reality, ceased to exist.

The simple mention of these laws evokes images of the utter degradation that so many South Africans have endured for so long. How, in the twentieth century, a society could segregate 84 per cent of its population and consign those people to 13 per cent of its land, classify its citizens and their rights according to race and declare public facilities off limits to the vast majority of its people is beyond comprehension.

While never forgetting the cruel past, we should now, together, look ahead to a brighter future for all South Africans. The Nordic countries believe that the process that is under way in South Africa cannot now be

(Mr. Breitenstein, Finland)

reversed. Many obstacles remain, but a united, democratic and non-racial South Africa will emerge from the rubble of apartheid.

Since the removal of the pillars of apartheid international attention has begun to shift towards the socio-economic situation in South Africa. Social and economic injustices caused by apartheid remain acute. Social and economic policies that go beyond the repeal of legislation are required. In this regard, however, the priorities will have to be decided democratically by South Africans in South Africa. In this connection the Nordic countries confirm their willingness to support the efforts that are being made in South Africa to secure democratization and to bridge the enormous economic and social gaps that the apartheid system has caused. We in the Nordic countries are monitoring closely the situation in South Africa so that we may be able to assess when it will be possible to repeal those sanctions that are still in force in the Nordic countries.

At a time when South Africa is advancing towards democracy it is most alarming that township violence has taken on such frightening proportions - more than 5,000 people having been killed since February last. The primary responsibility for halting this senseless cycle of violence lies with the South African Government. Reports of alleged involvement by members of the South African police and security forces in the instigation of violence must be thoroughly and impartially investigated.

The Nordic countries welcome the National Peace Accord, concluded in September, on a number of measures aimed at preventing violence. This Accord must be respected by all concerned. All parties and individuals have a responsibility to work for peace. If the violence is not brought under control the process of creating a democratic society in South Africa could be put at considerable risk.

(Mr. Breitenstein, Finland)

The quest for a better South Africa has come a long way since last year. The Nordic countries hope that at this session the General Assembly will again find it possible to adopt by consensus a resolution on the international efforts to help South Africa along the path to a democratic and non-racial future. It is important that international solidarity in support of the negotiating process that is now under way be again proclaimed with one voice.

Mr. ACHARYA (Nepal): I wish to begin by expressing my delegation's sincere appreciation to Mr. Nelson Mandela, President of the African National Congress, for sharing with us, in his address yesterday, his vision of a new South Africa. I wish also to express our appreciation for the statement made by Mr. Clarence Makhwetu, President of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania, to the General Assembly.

This year's General Assembly debate on apartheid is taking place at a time that is crucial for the people of South Africa. With the rapid transformation of international relations, the crumbling of apartheid under its own evil weight is only a matter of time. The question is how soon its end will come. The international community sincerely hopes for the rapid and peaceful transformation of South Africa into a non-racial, democratic society.

(Mr. Acharya, Nepal)

This hope is reflected in the historic consensus Declaration of the sixteenth special session of the General Assembly on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences on Southern Africa. The Declaration has laid down in clear terms the steps that the minority regime must take in order to create a climate conducive to negotiations for ending apartheid. The principles, guidelines and programme of action contained in the Declaration have been reaffimed by resolution 45/176 A and decision 45/457 B.

In recent years, some encouraging developments have taken place in South Africa. Removal of major laws institutionalizing apartheid from the statute books is indeed a welcome development. However, apartheid persists in attitudes and practices. Unless bold measures are taken, the repeal of apartheid laws will have little impact on the socio-economic disparities created by years of institutionalized racism.

The agreement between the South African Government and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees on the return of refugees and political exiles is another recent positive development. We also welcome the release in recent years of some political prisoners. However, many freedom fighters continue to be detained, particularly in the so-called independent homelands. Nepal joins the international community in demanding the release of all political prisoners without delay. We believe that such a measure is essential to the creation of a climate conducive to political negotiations.

My delegation is seriously concerned at the continuing violence in South Africa. Apartheid itself is an extreme form of violence against human life and dignity. Apartheid has institutionalized hatred and fostered violence.

(Mr. Acharya, Nepal)

The growing culture of violence seems to have been a sinister ploy to derail the ongoing political process. If allowed to fester, it will have a serious negative impact on the future of a democratic South Africa. Recent disclosures of the secret use of public funds to finance violent activities raises grave concern about the intentions of the minority regime. Even if we are to give it the benefit of the doubt, serious concerns remain with regard to the ability of the authorities to control security forces. We welcome the signing of the National Peace Accord in September of this year. Strict adherence to enforcement of the principles laid down in the Accord is essential for progress in the process of change in South Africa.

Nepal welcomes the agreement between the African National Congress and the Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania on a number of critical political issues. That agreement would strengthen the position of the freedom fighters in negotiations on the future of South Africa. In that context we have noted with satisfaction the convening of the preparatory meeting for the Convention for a Democratic South Africa. We sincerely hope that the negotiations will lead to a non-racial democratic society.

Nepal supports the critical process of advancement towards a peaceful and negotiated end of apartheid in South Africa. The steps already taken are important parts of the process. However, the basic principles enunciated in the Declaration of the sixteenth special session are still far from being realized. Only agreement and action upon modalities for the promulgation of a new constitution, together with transitional arrangements concerning the administration of the country until a new constitution takes effect, can make the movement towards the dismantling of apartheid irreversible. Until such

(Mr. Acharya, Nepal)

steps are taken, Nepal will continue to support the maintenance of appropriate pressures on the regime.

Such pressure will have to take forms of economic sanctions, and adherence to the arms embargo against South Africa imposed by the Security Council. In the meantime, resumption of what is called "people-to-people" links with democratic and unified non-racial organizations of South Africa should be pursued on a carefully selective basis. I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to pay a warm tribute for the statesmanship shown by the leadership of the national liberation movements in their legitimate struggle for the eradication of apartheid by peaceful means. Peaceful transition of South Africa to a non-racial democratic society will inaugurate a new era of peace and prosperity in the southern African region and will be a major step towards strengthening international peace and security.

I wish to express my appreciation to the Special Committee Against Apartheid for its comprehensive report on apartheid. I wish also to express our appreciation to the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa. The work of the Centre Against Apartheid has been commendable. The Special Committee, under the able leadership of Mr. Ibrahim Gambari of Nigeria, continues to be the focal point at the international level on issues of apartheid and South Africa. It has been playing a major role in coordinating international efforts for the ongoing process of broad-based negotiations on the establishment of a non-racial multiparty democracy in South Africa. We fully support the efforts of the Special Committee to maintain international consensus on the subject and to keep the important negotiations on track.

Mrs. RAKOTONDRAMBOA (Madagascar) (interpretation from French): Because of its geographical location and its colonial past, Madagascar cannot fail to be interested in developments in South Africa.

While we were pleased to note the repeal of the legal underpinnings of apartheid, we have also recognized that in practice apartheid cannot be erased overnight. The majority of the population of South Africa, in its daily life, continues to suffer under the yoke of decades of oppressive laws and discriminatory attitudes.

Nevertheless, ways to expedite the eradication of apartheid are now available to the people of South Africa. It is up to the different groups to implement them. Those means are political will in the case of the South African Government, acceptance of change in the case of the white minority and resolve to achieve their goals while preserving solidarity in the case of the liberation movements and the black political parties.

In that context, we have noted with optimism the formation of the United Patriotic Front. The Front is living proof that unity is the best possible weapon for liberation movements in coping with the difficulties inherent in the process now under way and in foiling the manoeuvres of certain groups whose deliberate intention it is to delay and even to prevent the advent of a new non-racial and democratic South Africa.

(Mrs. Rakotondramboa, Madagascar)

Liberation movements and anti-apartheid organizations that have come together in the Patriotic Front have made concessions and accepted compromises. They have demonstrated their political maturity by allowing their nation's highest interests to prevail over their party ambitions. The joint strategy set forth in the Durban Declaration is beginning to bear fruit, as indicated by the solidarity of black workers during the strikes held on 4 and 5 November 1991.

However, an even more important achievement of the united Front is to have accelerated the process by stressing the urgent need to enter into genuine negotiations on the future of South Africa. This brings us to an evaluation of those negotiations.

On 20 and 21 December 1991 the Convention for a Democratic South Africa will be held at Johannesburg with the participation of all groups, including the party of the South African Government. At this very moment a standing committee, which was set up on 29 and 30 November, is taking up the matters to be considered by the Convention.

All political groups - apart from the conservative party - have unanimously recognized the inevitability of negotiations and have agreed to the principles of fundamental rights. Differences emerge when attempts are made to define transitional arrangements and to establish the context for drawing up the future constitution. The liberation movements are calling for a transitional government and an elected constituent assembly; they are also hoping that the international community will participate, arguing that the South African Government, by virtue of its functions, will unavoidably be both judge and interested party. The South African Government, which was at first totally opposed to the idea of a transitional government and constituent

(Mrs. Rakotondramboa, Madagascar)

assembly, had based its position on the legality and constitutionality of its status. The South African Government has now stated that it is no longer opposed to the idea of transitional machinery, provided that such machinery be negotiated and determined by the multiparty Conference.

Madagascar is inclined to support the Patriotic/United Front, and I would here reiterate the statement made on 4 October in this forum by Mr. Césaire Rabenoro, the Madagascar Minister of Foreign Affairs, that the United Nations, if it is to be consistent in its efforts to combat apartheid, should offer all the parties its good offices, its mediation and even its arbitration. In our opinion, impartiality is essential if an atmosphere of confidence is to be created among the parties. It will make it possible to remove any possible ambiguities and, at the same time, guarantee the authenticity of the process.

It is therefore up to the South Africans themselves to define their country's future and to choose the manner in which it is to be realized. As a Member of the United Nations and as a neighbouring country, we hope that they will find a formula that narrows the differences while at the same time harming no group. A gamble, true, but such is the price of consensus.

My delegation remains concerned at the continuing violence in the black communities of South Africa. The signature of the National Peace Accord had given rise to hopes that order would be restored. However, such has not been the case. We urge the Government of South Africa to take firm action to stem the repeated waves of violence that are unleashed in the townships. An honest stand on the part of the South African authorities would help to put an end to that fratricidal struggle. We are all aware of the effects of violence

(Mrs. Rakotondramboa, Madagascar)

on the lives of that already disadvantaged sector of the population, and even now we can imagine the effect these massacres will have on the country's collective psyche. Thus, we urge all the parties to implement and respect the code of conduct jointly proclaimed at the peace conference. We invite them to work together and in good faith to defeat the forces - whichever they may be - th are responsible for the massacres. It goes without saying that such a climate of civil war is an obstacle to negotiations, slowing the economy and compromising the stability of post-apartheid South Africa.

I should now like to turn to the rather delicate and controversial question of the sanctions imposed on South Africa.

Madagascar favours keeping the mandatory sanctions with respect to an embargo on weapons decreed by the Security Council in 1977. As for the other sanctions, my country, bearing in mind the changing situation in South Africa and the ongoing international changes, tends to favour the selective and voluntary lifting of some of the economic, cultural and other sanctions.

We believe that each Member State should be responsible for judging the appropriateness of lifting selectively applied sanctions and for setting its own priorities and schedule for so doing. Madagascar is convinced that the opening created by the lifting of some sanctions, facilitating more direct contacts with Pretoria, will also make it possible to exert more direct and more positive pressure.

My delegation should like to emphasize that its position on sanctions in no way detracts from its support for the principles contained in the Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa, and we should like to take this opportunity to reiterate our support for the

(Mrs. Rakotondramboa, Madagascar)

liberation movements in their efforts to eradicate apartheid by peaceful means and realize a democratic, non-racial and united society in southern Africa.

My delegation would also like to express its appreciation to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees for its efforts to repatriate political refugees and exiles to South Africa. We are convinced that it will carry out its task effectively notwithstanding the difficulties and scale of that undertaking.

We would also like to express our satisfaction to the Special Committee against Apartheid. It is performing the difficult mission of leading the South African majority to democracy, demonstrating tenacity an analytical spirit and objectivity. We wholeheartedly support its appeal to the international community to give its full support to the ongoing process in South Africa, particularly by providing more material, financial and other assistance in order to help offset the crying socio-economic inequalities, especially in the fields of education, health, housing and social services. We particularly support the Special Committee's request that humanitarian aid be increased for the reintegration of political exiles and freed political prisoners.

A South Africa in transition is facing ambiguities and contradictions that impede its progress towards a non-racial democracy and threaten to plunge it into chaos. At the same time, however, that fragile process embodies the aspirations and hopes of an entire people. My delegation remains confident that common sense, justice and law will prevail and that the day is not far off when South Africa will rejoin the comity of nations in which all will acknowledge its rightful role.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.